

From: [James McKenna](#)
To: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rjw@nwnatural.com](#)
Cc: [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [jworonets@anchorenv.com](#)
Subject: RE: EPA comments re:PBDE risk calculations
Date: 04/27/2011 09:02 AM

Thank you Chip (and Elizabeth and Laura!). This is very helpful and we will pass it on to Exec this morning.

Jim.

From: [Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov](#) [Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 8:54 AM
To: James McKenna; [rjw@nwnatural.com](#)
Cc: [Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Allen.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov](#); [jworonets@anchorenv.com](#)
Subject: EPA comments re:PBDE risk calculations

Jim & Bob,

Elizabeth Allen and Laura Kennedy recently discussed possible ways to meet the intent of Comment 4 of EPA's April 11, 2011 comments on LWG's March 17, 2011 submittal of the revised risk calculations for the PH BHHRA. Their recommendation is that a discussion of the contribution of carcinogenic risks and noncarcinogenic hazard due to PBDE exposures be presented in the risk characterization section of the BHHRA. As appropriate, PBDEs will be identified in Table 5-189 for further evaluation. EPA concurs with the recommended approach. The intent of EPA's comment 4 was not to require inclusion of PBDE risks in each receptor-specific and location-specific table in the BHHRA, and presentation of that information in an attachment is also acceptable.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

thanks
Chip